

Appl. No. 10/714,416  
Transmitted by Facsimile on: October 18, 2006  
Transmitted by Facsimile to: 571-273-8300

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**OCT 18 2006**

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, and 17 are independent claims. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims. All of the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,122,763 (hereinafter "Pyndiah"). Applicant disagrees with the rejections for the reasons set forth below.

### Claim 1.

Claim 1 recites a method for encoding information signals, comprising:

loading information symbols into a data array with  $n^{(1)}$  rows and  $n^{(2)}$  columns, wherein each column has  $k_i^{(1)}$  information symbols, and wherein  $k^{(1)}$  is an array that has at least two different values;

encoding each column with a code  $C_i^{(1)}$  from a family of nested codes  $C^{(1)}$ , wherein  $C^{(1)}$  includes two different nested codes; and

encoding each row with a code  $C^{(2)}$ .

Claim 1 was rejected with reference to Fig. 2 and column 10, lines 41-63 of Pyndiah. Fig. 2 discloses a method in which a rectangular matrix is formed having  $k_1$  rows and  $k_2$  columns (21). Code is applied to the rows to add check symbols and expand the matrix to  $n_2$  columns (22). Similarly, code is applied to the columns to add check symbols and expand the matrix to  $n_1$  rows (23).

However, Fig. 2 of Pyndiah fails to teach or suggest the element "*each column has  $k_i^{(1)}$  information symbols, and wherein  $k^{(1)}$  is an array that has at least two different values*" from claim 1. In contrast, Fig. 2 of Pyndiah teaches a matrix in which each column has the same number of information symbols. Check symbols are added, but the columns of information symbols do not have at least two different values. *See*, for example, the right portion of Fig. 2 in which matrix {a} has  $k_1$  information symbols in each column at step 21, wherein matrix {b} still has  $k_1$  information symbols in each column at step 22, and wherein matrix {c} still has  $k_1$  information symbols in each column. Additional check symbols are added to yield a total of  $n_1$  symbols in each column as a result of the code applied to the columns in step 23. However, the number of information symbols stays the same.

Appl. No. 10/714,416Transmitted by Facsimile on: October 18, 2006Transmitted by Facsimile to: 571-273-8300

In addition, Fig. 2 of Pyndiah fails to teach the element "*encoding each column with a code  $C_i^{(1)}$  from a family of nested codes  $C^{(1)}$ , wherein  $C^{(1)}$  includes two different nested codes*" from claim 1. In contrast, Fig. 2 of Pyndiah teaches applying the same code  $C_1$  to the columns. *See*, reference 23 in Fig. 2 of Pyndiah. This part of Fig. 2 of Pyndiah teaches away from the claimed invention because it specifically teaches applying the same code,  $C_1$ , to all of the  $n_2$  columns.

The Action also cites Pyndiah at column 10, lines 41-63. This text of Pyndiah is with reference to Fig. 4 and discusses the decoding process. However, this text also fails to teach the elements of claim 1 which were cited above with reference to Fig. 2.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited references of Pyndiah fail to teach at least several elements recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

#### Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites the method of claim 1, wherein the codes in the family of codes  $C^{(1)}$  are selected from the group consisting of BCH codes, Reed-Solomon codes, and Reed-Muller codes. Claim 2 is rejected based on Applicant's admitted prior art on page 3, lines 5-30, of the present application.

Applicant did describe several examples of prior art codes in the Background section of the present application, including BCH codes and Reed Solomon codes of page 3 of the present application. Applicant does not claim to have invented those codes and none of the claims recite the use of those codes outside of the context of the present invention. However, Applicant did not say that the prior art teaches or suggests combining such codes with the data array and encoding method recited in claim 1. In fact, Applicant believes that there is no such teaching in the prior art to combine the particular elements recited in claims 1 and 2. Furthermore, the only motivation to combine such elements is in the description of the present invention, and not in the description of the prior art.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there is no teaching to combine the know prior art codes with the elements recited in claim 1 and, therefore, that claim 2 is in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/714,416  
Transmitted by Facsimile on: October 18, 2006  
Transmitted by Facsimile to: 571-273-8300

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**OCT 18 2006**

Remaining Claims

The remaining independent claims 3, 6, 9, 12, and 17 are rejected on grounds similar to those used to reject claim 1 and those claims have limitations similar to at least one of the limitations cited in the above discussion with regard to claim 1. In particular, independent claim 3 was rejected by citing the same portion of Pyndiah as was cited in rejecting claim 1. Independent claim 6 was rejected "for the same reasons as per claim 1". Independent claim 9 was rejected by citing the same portion of Pyndiah as was cited in rejecting claim 1.

Independent claim 12 was rejected by citing the same portion of Pyndiah as was cited in rejecting claim 1 and also by citing Pyndiah at Fig. 7 and column 13, lines 1-25. However, Fig. 7 and the cited text fail to teach the elements of claim 1 which were cited above in the discussion of claim 1.

Independent claim 17 was rejected by citing the same portion of Pyndiah as was cited in rejecting claim 1 and also by citing Pyndiah at Fig. 1. However, Fig. 1 fails to teach the elements of claim 1 which were cited above in the discussion of claim 1.

Dependent claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 are similar to claim 2 and are rejected on grounds similar to that used to reject claim 2. The remaining dependent claims depend, directly or indirectly, from the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that the remaining claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above with regard to at least one of claims 1 and 2.


Conclusion.

For the reasons set forth herein, Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections in the Action be withdrawn and that the application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions pertaining to this Response or to the subject matter of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Appl. No. 10/714.416  
Transmitted by Facsimile on: October 18, 2006  
Transmitted by Facsimile to: 571-273-8300

Applicant believes that no fees are due with this Response. However, in the event fees are due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit such fees from Charge Account Number 50-3198, in the name of Dickie, McCamey & Chilcote.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Darren E. Wolf  
Registration No. 36,310  
412-392-5681